# Factorization of Saddle-point Matrices in Dynamical Systems Optimization—Updating Bunch-Parlett

Jan Kuřátko*†

March 28, 2017

arXiv:1703.09012v1 [math.OC] 27 Mar 2017

**Abstract**

In this paper we consider the application of direct methods for solving saddle-point systems that arise in the problem of optimization of dynamical systems. We describe the structure of nonzero elements in the factor $L$ in the $LDL^T$ factorization of the saddle-point matrix arising in such problems. Moreover, we develop a hybrid method that copes with the ill-conditioning of the $(1,1)$ block of the saddle-point matrix. In the end we describe a monitoring strategy for the pivots selection in the Bunch-Parlett factorization. This will allow us to use already computed permutations in order to reduce the work spent on searching for pivots.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we improve the behaviour of direct methods for solving saddle-point systems that arise in the problem of optimization of dynamical systems [13]. In this optimization problem one seeks a solution of a dynamical system that originates in a given set of initial states and reaches another set of states that are to be avoided, unsafe states. One can find the motivation for solving this optimization problem for example in control and verification of hybrid systems [5, 8, 18, 25] and in motion planning [15, 20]. In addition, the techniques described in this paper apply to general underdetermined boundary value problems for ordinary differential equations [1]. Moreover, similar saddle-point matrices to ours arise, for example, in the mixed and hybrid finite element discretizations [23].

The saddle-point matrices that arise in such optimization problems are sparse, whether one uses the SQP method [17] or the interior-point method [16]. Hence, direct methods for solving the saddle-point system look promising. However, the naive application of straightforward $LDL^T$ factorization results in a failure due to ill-conditioning [13]. In this paper we develop a direct method that successfully solves the saddle-point system.

Denoting the saddle-point matrix and its factorization by

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} H & B \\ B^T & -C \end{bmatrix} = LDL^T,$$

the main contributions of this paper are: the description of the banded structure of the factor $L$; the description of the banded structure of the Schur complement $S = K/H$; an algorithm for the computation of the $LDL^T$ factorization of the Schur complement $S$ without storing the whole matrix in memory. In addition, we develop a method that

*ORCID: 0000-0003-0105-6527; Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Czech Republic; Institute of Computer Science, The Czech Academy of Sciences

†This work was supported by the Czech Science Foundation (GACR) grant number GA15-14484S with institutional support RVO:67985807.

decides when to switch from $LDL^T$ with no pivoting strategies to the Bunch-Parlett method [7]. It is shown the saddle-point matrix has the $(1,1)$ block $H$ ill-conditioned when we are close to a minimum [13], and that causes numerical problems during the computation. Therefore, we aim at balancing the speed with the stability of computation. Furthermore, we describe the pivot monitoring strategy that allows us to reuse and update the permutation matrices in the Bunch-Parlett method.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we briefly review the optimization problem we try to solve [13]. In section 3 we describe the structure of the saddle-point matrices. We will compute the $LDL^T$ factorization and prove that the factor $L$ has a banded structure of nonzero elements in section 4. Then the discussion about the implementation of the $LDL^T$ factorization follows and a hybrid method for solving the saddle-point system is described in section 5. Furthermore we include numerical results in section 7. The whole paper is concluded with a summary and a brief discussion of results in section 8.

# 2 Original Problem

Our motivation originates from the field of computer aided verification [5, 15, 25]. Consider a system of ordinary differential equations such that

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t)), \quad x(0) = x_0, \tag{1}$$

where $x : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^k$ is a function of variable $t \geq 0$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ is continuously differentiable. We denote the *flow* of the vector field $f$ in (1) by $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ and for the fixed $x_0$ one has the solution $x(t)$ of (1), where $x(t) = \Phi(t, x_0)$ for $t \geq 0$.

Denote the set of initial states by Init and the set of states we try to avoid by Unsafe. Our goal is to find any solution $x(t)$ of (1) such that $x_0 \in$ Init and $\Phi(t_f, x_0) \in$ Unsafe for some $t_f > 0$, if it exists.

In our previous work [13] we solve this boundary value problem by the *multiple-shooting* method [2]. That is, one computes a solution of (1) from shorter solution segments. Suppose we have $N$ solution segments of (1) such that their initial states are denoted by $x_0^i$ and their lengths by $t_i > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$. Then the desired solution to our problem satisfies: $x_0^1 \in$ Init, $x_0^{i+1} = \Phi(t_i, x_0^i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq N-1$ (these are the matching conditions), and $\Phi(t_N, x_0^N) \in$ Unsafe.

Boundary conditions $x_0^1 \in$ Init and $\Phi(t_N, x_0^N) \in$ Unsafe can be formulated either as equalities (points belong to the boundaries of the sets), or it can be given as inequalities (points are insides of sets). Either way there are infinitely many solutions [14], therefore, one needs to introduce a regularization. In the paper [14], an objective function in the form $\sum t_i^2$, where $t_i$ is the length of the $i$-th solution segment, is introduced that drives the solution segments to have the same lengths.

In the end one solves a general nonlinear programming problem with $N(k+1)$ parameters, where those parameters are lengths of solution segments $t_i > 0$ and initial states $x_0^i \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. From now onwards we denote the number of parameters by $n = N(k+1)$ and the number of constraints by $m = (N-1)k + 2$.

Note that one can work with a more general dynamical systems than in (1) such as *switched* systems and hybrid dynamical systems [9, 25]. To do that one needs to be able to compute or approximate [4, 12] the sensitivity functions $\partial\Phi(t_i, x_0^i)/\partial x_0^i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, in order to form the Jacobian of constraints $B$.

# 3 Saddle-point Matrix

We consider the solution of a $2 \times 2$ block linear system of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} H & B \\ B^T & -C \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad Ku = b\,, \tag{2}$$

where $H \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$ with $n \geq m$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$. Since we are interested in the $LDL^T$ factorization of the saddle-point matrix $K$ that arises in the solution of reachability problems for dynamical systems [13], the blocks $H$ and $B$ have the form

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} H_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & H_N \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} v & -M_1^T & & & & & \\ & -v_1^T & & & & & \\ & I & -M_2^T & & & & \\ & & -v_2^T & & & & \\ & & I & & & & \\ & & & \ddots & & & \\ & & & & -M_{N-1}^T & & \\ & & & & -v_{N-1}^T & & \\ & & & & I & w & \\ & & & & 0 & \beta & \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

The matrix $H$ consists of blocks $H_i \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+1)\times(k+1)}$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. The matrix $C = diag(\gamma_1, 0, \ldots, 0, \gamma_2)$, where $\gamma_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. In the matrix $B$, there are blocks $M_i \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$ and vectors $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $1 \leq i \leq N-1$. The matrix $I \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$ is the identity matrix of order $k$, the vectors $v$ and $w$ are nonzero and belong to $\mathbb{R}^k$, and $\beta$ is a nonzero scalar. The first and the last columns of the matrix $B$ correspond to the boundary constraints $x_0^1 \in$ Init and $\Phi(t_N, x_0^N) \in$ Unsafe.

A similar banded structure of nonzero elements to the one in the matrix $B$ arises, for example, when one solves boundary value problems for ordinary differential equations [1, Sec. 5]. However, we have additional entries $v_i$ in (3) because we consider the lengths of time intervals $t_i$ (the lengths of solution segments) to be parameters and not fixed values.

The saddle-point matrix $K$ satisfies the following conditions [13]: the matrix $H$ is symmetric positive definite (*BFGS* approximations of the Hessian), and the matrix $B$ has full column rank. Under these conditions the saddle point matrix $K$ is: nonsingular [3, Th. 3.1], indefinite [3, Th. 3.5], strongly factorizable [24, Th. 2.1].

The Line-search SQP method described in [13] requires in each iteration the solution of the saddle-point system (2), where the elements of the matrix $B$ and $C$ need to be recomputed and the matrix $H$ is updated block by block by the *BFGS* scheme. The structure of nonzero elements of the matrix $B$ in (3) remains the same throughout the iterations.

It was observed that the *BFGS* approximations result in the matrix $H$ approaching a singular matrix as the iteration process progresses [13]. Denoting the two consecutive iterates by $H^i$ and $H^{i+1}$ one gets

$$H^{i+1} = H^i + uu^T - vv^T\,, \tag{4}$$

where $uu^T$ and $vv^T$ are rank-one updates [19, Ch. 6]. In the first iteration one can set $H^1$ to be the identity matrix and the cost of the update in (4) is $O(n^2)$.

Note that when we have the $LDL^T$ factorization of the matrix $H^i$, then we can use it and update it to get the $LDL^T$ factorization of $H^{i+1}$ by formulas for the rank-one updates [10, p. 42], [22] and downdates [10, p. 43]. We call the rank-one update the step from the $LDL^T$ factorization of $H^i$ to the $LDL^T$ factorization of $H^i + uu^T$. The rank-one dowdate computes the $LDL^T$ factorization of $(H^i + uu^T) - vv^T$ from the $LDL^T$

factorization of $H^i + uu^T$. We are allowed to do this when the resulting matrix remains symmetric positive definite. Since the BFGS method returns $H^{i+1}$ that is symmetric positive definite [19] we can use the rank-one downdate to save computation time. Updating and downdating require $O(n^2)$ flops [10, p. 42-43]. This is a reduction from $O(n^3)$ flops required in the case of the new $LDL^T$ factorization of $H^{i+1}$.

In our motivational application the matrix $H$ is block diagonal (3), therefore, the updating from $H^i$ to $H^{i+1}$ requires $O((k+1)^2)$. Each block $H_i$ in (3), $1 \leq i \leq N$, can be and should be treated separately.

# 4 $LDL^T$ Factorization

In this section we give formulas for the $LDL^T$ factorization of the saddle-point matrix $K$ with blocks (3). In addition, we describe the structure of nonzero elements of the unit lower triangular factor $L$ for which $K = LDL^T$.

Denote by $L_H D_H L_H^T$ the $LDL^T$ factorization of the matrix $H$ and by $L_S D_S L_S^T$ the $LDL^T$ factorization of the Schur complement $S = K/H$, where $S = -C - B^T H^{-1} B$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} H & B \\ B^T & -C \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} L_H & 0 \\ B^T L_H^{-T} D_H^{-1} & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D_H & 0 \\ 0 & S \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_H^T & D_H^{-1} L_H^{-1} B \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} L_H & 0 \\ B^T L_H^{-T} D_H^{-1} & L_S \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D_H & 0 \\ 0 & D_S \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_H^T & D_H^{-1} L_H^{-1} B \\ 0 & L_S^T \end{bmatrix} \\ &= LDL^T . \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The solution of the saddle-point system (2) by the $LDL^T$ factorization is described in Alg. 1 [11, Ch. 4.1].

**Algorithm 1** Solve $Ku = b$ for $u$ by the $LDL^T$ factorization

Input: $K$ and the right-hand side vector $b$
Factorize the matrix $K = LDL^T$
Solve $Lz = b$ for $z$ ▷ Forward elimination
Solve $Dw = z$ for $w$
Solve $L^T u = w$ for $u$ ▷ Back substitution
Output: the solution $u$ to the system $Ku = b$

When forming the factor $L$ one factorizes $H = L_H D_H L_H^T$ and then $S = L_S D_S L_S^T$. One approach to the computation of the factor $L$ is summarized in Alg. 2 and follows the framework of the solution of *equilibrium systems* [11, p. 170].

**Algorithm 2** Factorize the matrix $K = LDL^T$

Input: $K$
Factorize the matrix $H = L_H D_H L_H^T$ ▷ $LDL^T$ factorization of $H$
Solve $L_H D_H X = B$ for $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$
$S \leftarrow -C - X^T D_H X$ ▷ Schur complement $S$
Factorize the matrix $S = L_S D_S L_S^T$ ▷ $LDL^T$ factorization of $S$
$D \leftarrow diag(D_H, D_S)$
$L \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} L_H & 0 \\ X^T & L_S \end{bmatrix}$
Output: factors $L$ and $D$ such that $K = LDL^T$

Since the matrix $H$ from (3) is block diagonal, one obtains

$$L_H D_H L_H^T = \begin{bmatrix} L_{H,1} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & L_{H,N} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D_{H,1} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & D_{H,N} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_{H,1}^T & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & L_{H,N}^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where $L_{H,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+1)\times(k+1)}$ is unit lower triangular and $D_{H,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+1)\times(k+1)}$ is diagonal, $1 \le i \le N$.

**Lemma 1.** *Let $K = LDL^T$ be the $LDL^T$ factorization of the saddle-point matrix (2). Then the $(1,1)$ block $L_H$ of the factor $L$ is block diagonal and its blocks $L_{H,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+1)\times(k+1)}$,$1 \le i \le N$, are unit lower triangular.*

*Proof.* The matrix $H$ (3) is symmetric positive definite, therefore, each $H_i$, $1 \le i \le N$, is symmetric positive definite. When one carries out the $LDL^T$ factorization of $H_i$, then one obtains factors $L_{H,i}$ and $D_{H,i}$ such that $H_i = L_{H,i} D_{H,i} L_{H,i}^T$ for $1 \le i \le N$. The $LDL^T$ factorization of $H$ can be written in the matrix form as in (6), where $L_{H,i}$ is unit lower triangular and $D_{H,i}$ is diagonal with the $1 \times 1$ pivots on the diagonal, $1 \le i \le N$. □

We proceed with the computation of $B^T L_H^{-T} D_H^{-1}$ in the factor $L$ in (5).

**Lemma 2.** *Let $K = LDL^T$ be the $LDL^T$ factorization of the saddle-point matrix (2). Then*

$$B^T L_H^{-T} D_H^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} s_1^T & & & & & & \\ X_1 & Y_2 & & & & & \\ & X_2 & Y_3 & & & & \\ & & \ddots & & & & \\ & & & X_{N-2} & Y_{N-1} & & \\ & & & & X_{N-1} & Y_N & \\ & & & & & s_2^T & \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

*where*

$$\begin{aligned} s_1 &= D_{H,1}^{-1} L_{H,1}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} v \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}, \\ X_i &= [M_i \ v_i] L_{H,i}^{-T} D_{H,i}^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times(k+1)}, \\ Y_i &= [I \ 0] L_{H,i}^{-T} D_{H,i}^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times(k+1)}, \\ s_2 &= D_{H,N}^{-1} L_{H,N}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} w \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

*where $[v^T \ 0]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$, $[w^T \ \beta]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$, $[I \ 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times(k+1)}$ and $[M_i \ v_i] \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times(k+1)}$ for $1 \le i \le N-1$.*

*Proof.* The result follows from the direct computation of the matrix product $BL_H^{-T} D_H^{-1}$. The matrix $B$ is given in (3) and factors $L_H$ and $D_H$ in (6). Since $L_H$ is block diagonal, then its inverse $L_H^{-1}$ is also block diagonal with blocks of the same size. □

To finish the description of the factor $L$ in (5) one needs to compute the Schur complement $S = K/H$ and factorize it. Lemma 3 shows the block 3-diagonal structure of the Schur complement $S$.

**Lemma 3.** *The Schur complement $S = -C - B^T H^{-1} B$ has the form*

$$S = -\begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 & w_1^T & & & & & \\ w_1 & V_1 & W_1^T & & & & \\ & W_1 & V_2 & & & & \\ & & & \ddots & & & \\ & & & & V_{N-2} & W_{N-2}^T & \\ & & & & W_{N-2} & V_{N-1} & w_2 \\ & & & & & w_2^T & \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

*where*

$$\alpha_1 = [v^T\ 0]H_1^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} v \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \gamma_1 \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

$$w_1 = [M_1^T\ v_1]H_1^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} v \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^k\,,$$

$$V_i = [M_i^T\ v_i]H_i^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} M_i \\ v_i^T \end{bmatrix} + [I\ 0]H_{i+1}^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}\,,$$

$$W_i = [M_{i+1}^T\ v_{i+1}]H_{i+1}^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}\,,$$

$$w_2 = [I\ 0]H_N^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} w \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^k\,,$$

$$\alpha_2 = [w^T\ \beta]H_N^{-1}\begin{bmatrix} w \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} + \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

*with* $[v^T\ 0]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$, $[w^T\ \beta]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$, $[I\ 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times(k+1)}$, $\gamma_1 \geq 0$ *and* $\gamma_2 \geq 0$ *from the matrix* $C$, *and* $[M_i^T\ v_i] \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times(k+1)}$ *for* $1 \leq i \leq N-1$.

*Proof.* The result follows from the matrix product $BH^{-1}B^T$, where $H^{-1}$ is a block diagonal matrix and $B$ is given in (3). The matrix $C = diag(\gamma_1, 0, \ldots, 0, \gamma_2)$, therefore, it only affects the values $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ in (8). □

The block structure of the Schur complement $S$ allows us to carry out the factorization of a tri-diagonal block matrix. We shall illustrate the whole process for $N = 3$. Then

$$S = -\begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 & w_1^T & & \\ w_1 & V_1 & W_1^T & \\ & W_1 & V_2 & w_2 \\ & & w_2^T & \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ w_1/\alpha_1 & \hat{V}_1 & W_1^T & \\ & W_1 & V_2 & w_2 \\ & & w_2^T & \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\hat{V}_1 = V_1 - w_1 w_1^T/\alpha_1$. The *minus* sign is contained in the matrix $D_S$. Once we form the $LDL^T$ factorization of $\hat{V}_1 = \hat{L}_1\hat{D}_1\hat{L}_1^T$, then

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ w_1/\alpha_1 & \hat{V}_1 & W_1^T & \\ & W_1 & V_2 & w_2 \\ & & w_2^T & \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ w_1/\alpha_1 & \hat{L}_1 & & \\ & W_1\hat{L}_1^{-T}\hat{D}_1^{-1} & \hat{V}_2 & w_2 \\ & & w_2^T & \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\hat{V}_2 = V_2 - W_1\hat{L}_1^{-T}\hat{D}_1^{-1}\hat{L}_1^{-1}W_1^T = V_2 - W_1\hat{V}_1^{-1}W_1^T$. Once more we form the $LDL^T$ factorization of $\hat{V}_2 = \hat{L}_2\hat{D}_2\hat{L}_2^T$, then

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ w_1/\alpha_1 & \hat{L}_1 & & \\ & W_1\hat{L}_1^{-T}\hat{D}_1^{-1} & \hat{V}_2 & w_2 \\ & & w_2^T & \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ w_1/\alpha_1 & \hat{L}_1 & & \\ & W_1\hat{L}_1^{-T}\hat{D}_1^{-1} & \hat{L}_2 & \\ & & w_2^T\hat{L}_2^{-T}\hat{D}_2^{-1} & \hat{\alpha}_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_2 = \alpha_2 - w_2^T\hat{L}_2^{-T}\hat{D}_2^{-1}\hat{L}_2^{-1}w_2 = \alpha_2 - w_2^T\hat{V}_2^{-1}w_2$. Finally, we put $\hat{\alpha}_2$ into the diagonal matrix $D_S$ and set the last elemental on the diagonal in $L_S$ to one.

**Lemma 4.** *Let* $S = L_S D_S L_S^T$ *be the* $LDL^T$ *factorization of the Schur complement* $S = K/H$, *then*

$$L_S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & & & \\ l_1 & \hat{L}_1 & & & & \\ & W_1\hat{L}_1^{-T}D_{S,1}^{-1} & \hat{L}_2 & & & \\ & & \ddots & & & \\ & & & W_{N-2}\hat{L}_{N-2}^{-T}D_{S,N-2}^{-1} & \hat{L}_{N-1} & \\ & & & & l_2^T & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{9}$$



Figure 1: The structure of nonzero entries: The saddle-point matrix $K$ on the left hand side and the unit lower triangular factor $L$ on the right hand side . For this instance, there are 9250 nonzero elements in $K$ and 14830 nonzero elements in $L$. The dimension of matrices is $832 \times 832$.

*where* $\hat{L}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$, $1 \le i \le N-1$, *are unit lower-triangular,* $l_1 \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $l_2 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ *and the diagonal matrix* $D_S$ *is such that*

$$D_S = \begin{bmatrix} d_1 & & & & \\ & D_{S,1} & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & D_{S,N-1} & \\ & & & & d_N \end{bmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

*where* $d_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $d_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $D_{S,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{k\times k}$ *for* $1 \le i \le N-1$. *Here* $d_1 = \alpha_1$ *from* (8) *and* $d_N = \alpha_2 - w_2^T \hat{L}_{N-1}^{-T} D_{S,N-1}^{-1} \hat{L}_{N-1}^{-1} w_2$. *The scalar* $\alpha_2$ *and the vector* $w_2$ *come from* (8).

Lemmas 1, 2 and 4 describe the block structure of the factor $L$. Note that both matrices $B^T L_H^{-T} D_H^{-1}$ and $L_S$ are banded and their width is independent of $N$. In Fig. 1, it is illustrated what the structures of nonzero entries of the saddle-point matrix $K$ and its factor $L$ are.

We conclude this section by the observation that for the block $L_S$ the option for parallel computation of blocks $V_i$ and $W_i$ at the same time in (8) is no longer available as in the case of the block $L_H$ in (6). However, we do not need to keep the whole Schur complement $S$ in memory to get $L_S$ as it is shown in the discussion preceding Lemma 4 and summarized in Alg. 3.

# 5 Hybrid Algorithm

The accuracy of the computed solution $u$ of the saddle-point system (2) by Alg. 1 depends on the condition number of $H$. For the matrix $K$ is indefinite the condition number of $K$ may be much smaller than the condition number of $H$ [11, p. 171]. Such behaviour is encountered in our original problem [13]. Therefore, one may try to find a permutation matrix $P$ such that the factorization $PKP^T = LDL^T$ gives better numerical results.

One such approach is the Bunch-Parlett factorization [7]. However, this leads to a dense factor $L$ as illustrated in Fig. 2. In addition finding elements for a pivoting

**Algorithm 3** Factorize the matrix $S = L_S D_S L_S^T$

Input: matrix $S$ of the form (8)
$d_1 \leftarrow \alpha_1$ and $l_1 \leftarrow w_1/d_1$
**for** $i = 1$ to $N-1$ **do**
  **if** $i = 1$ **then**
    Factorize the matrix $V_i - l_1 d_1 l_1^T = \hat{L}_1 D_{S,1} \hat{L}_1^T$
  **else**
    Solve $\hat{L}_{i-1} D_{S,i-1} X = W_{i-1}^T$ for $X \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$
    $\hat{L}_{i,i-1} \leftarrow X^T$ ▷ Sub-diagonal block of $L_S$
    Factorize the matrix $V_i - \hat{L}_{i,i-1} D_{S,i-1}^{-1} \hat{L}_{i,i-1}^T = \hat{L}_i D_{S,i} \hat{L}_i^T$
  **end if**
**end for**
Solve $\hat{L}_{N-1} D_{S,N-1} l_2 = w_2$ for $l_2 \in \mathbb{R}^k$
$d_N \leftarrow \alpha_2 - l_2^T D_{S,N-1}^{-1} l_2$
$D_S \leftarrow diag(d_1, D_{S,1}, \ldots, D_{S,N}, d_N)$
Output: factors $L_S$ and $D_S$ such that $S = L_S D_S L_S^T$

strategy is very expensive and one needs to search a matrix for its maximal off-diagonal element. For a nonsingular symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the pivoting strategy requires between $n^3/12$ and $n^3/6$ comparisons [7, Sec. 6.3]. On the other hand the Bunch-Parlett factorization is nearly as stable as the $LU$ factorization with complete pivoting [7].

The *BFGS* approximations result in the matrix $H$ approaching a singular matrix as the iteration process progresses [13]. Therefore, the accuracy of computed solutions by Alg. 1 deteriorates [11, p. 171]. In order to improve the stability one can try to modify the matrix $D_H$ in the $LDL^T$ factorization of the matrix $H$. One common approach is to change the diagonal matrix $D_H$ so that its condition number is less than $1/\varepsilon_H$, where $\varepsilon_H$ is a small constant. We found it difficult to set the value for the parameter $\varepsilon_H$ and tried several values from the interval $[10^{-12}, 10^{-6}]$. The performance of Alg. 1 is sensitive to the choice for $\varepsilon_H$. These considerations are summarized in Alg. 4.

**Algorithm 4** Modification of the diagonal matrix $D_H$

Input: matrix $D_H = diag(d_1, \ldots d_n)$, constant $\varepsilon_H$
**for** $k = 1$ to $n$ **do**
  **if** $|d_k| < \varepsilon_H \|D_H\|$ **then**
    $d_k \leftarrow sign(d_k) \varepsilon_H \|D_H\|$
  **else**
    leave $d_k$ unchanged
  **end if**
**end for**
Output: the diagonal matrix $D = diag(d_1, \ldots, d_n)$

Even with this modification the optimization method [13], using Line-search SQP, may still fail at computing the optimum. This happened to us in several cases when we used benchmark problems from [13]. Therefore, we do not use Alg. 4.

However, we observed that the application of Bunch-Parlett instead of Alg. 1 with the modification in Alg. 4 did not fail and delivered desired results. This leads us to the formulation of a hybrid method Alg. 5 that switches at some point from the straightforward $LDL^T$ factorization without pivoting. Our idea is to use Alg. 1 as long as possible until the condition number of $D_H$ gets *large*. When this behaviour is detected the method switches for Bunch-Parlett to finish. From numerical testing we found a suitable rule for



Figure 2: The structure of nonzero entries: On the left hand side is the saddle-point matrix $K$ and on the right hand side is the unit lower triangular factor $L$, where $PKP^T = LDL^T$ by Bunch-Parlett. For this instance, there are 9250 nonzero elements in $K$ and 146291 nonzero elements in $L$. The dimension of matrices is $832 \times 832$.

switching to be that condition number of the diagonal matrix $D_H$ is greater than $1/\sqrt[3]{\varepsilon}$, where the machine precision $\varepsilon \approx 10^{-16}$.

One alternative to Bunch-Parlett and its selection of pivots in Alg. 5 is to use the Bunch-Kaufman method [6]. There, one only needs $O(n^2)$ comparisons. This method is faster and less stable than Bunch-Parlett [6]. Therefore, our goal in the next section is to reduce the amount of work spent on searching for pivots in Bunch-Parlett and consequently for Bunch-Kaufman as well. For completeness, we compare both approaches in section 7.

# 6 Updating the Matrix $P$

We do not need to compute a new permutation for the Bunch-Parlett method in every iteration and may try to use and update the one from the previous iteration in Alg. 5. Let $P_i K_i P_i^T = L_i D_i L_i^T$ be the Bunch-Parlett factorization of the saddle-point matrix $K_i$ from the $i$-th iteration in Alg. 5. In the very next iteration we try to compute $P_i K_{i+1} P_i^T = L_{i+1} D_{i+1} L_{i+1}^T$, where $D_{i+1}$ has the same pattern of $1 \times 1$ and $2 \times 2$ pivots as the matrix $D_i$. Such a factorization of $K_{i+1}$ may not exist and we need to monitor the pivots and update the permutation matrix $P_i$ if necessary.

In the paper [22] there is an algorithm for updating a matrix factorization. However, the method works for matrices of the form $K_{i+1} = K_i + \sigma v v^T$, where $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ and $\sigma v v^T$ is a rank-one matrix. This is not the case in the problem we try to solve.

We employ the following *monitoring* strategy as we follow the pattern of pivots of $D_i$ and factorize the permuted saddle-point matrix $P_i K_{i+1} P_i^T$. If the $1 \times 1$ pivot $\beta$ satisfies $|\beta| > \varepsilon_1$, where $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, we use it and leave $P_i$ unchanged. If not, we apply the Bunch-Parlett method on the reduced matrix and update the permutation. In the case of the $2 \times 2$ pivot $\beta = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ b & c \end{bmatrix}$ we accept it if $|ac - b^2| > \varepsilon_1$ and $\|\beta\| < \varepsilon_2$. If these conditions do not hold we apply the Bunch-Parlett method on the reduced matrix and update the permutation $P_i$.

The $1 \times 1$ pivot is useful if and only if $|\beta|$ is large relative to the largest off-diagonal element in absolute value [7, Sec. 4.2]. Therefore, we only bound its modulus from below and the larger it is the better. However, it may happen that $|\beta|$ is small compared to

**Algorithm 5** Hybrid method

Input: $K$ and the right hand side $b$, machine precision $\varepsilon$
difficult $\leftarrow False$, $H \leftarrow I$
**while** stopping criteria in *Line-search SQP* are not met **do**
  **if** difficult **then** ▷ The matrix $H$ is ill-conditioned
    Factorize the matrix $PKP^T = LDL^T$ ▷ The Bunch-Parlett method
    Solve $Lw = Pb$ for $w$
    Solve $Dz = w$ for $z$
    Solve $L^T u = z$ for $u$
    $u \leftarrow P^T u$ ▷ Permute elements in the solution $u$
    Update $H$, $B$ and $b$ from the solution $u$ ▷ Use *BFGS* for $H$
  **else**
    Factorize $H = L_H D_H L_H^T$
    **if** $\kappa(D_H) > 1/\sqrt[3]{\varepsilon}$ **then** ▷ Check the condition number of $D_H$
      difficult $\leftarrow True$
    **else**
      Solve $Ku = b$ for $u$ by the $LDL^T$ factorization ▷ No pivoting
      Update $H$, $B$, $M$ and $b$ from the solution $u$ ▷ Use *BFGS* for $H$
    **end if**
  **end if**
**end while**
Output: the solution $u$

off-diagonal elements and that causes the increase in the magnitudes of elements in the factor $L$ and the reduced matrix. That is the reason for introducing the second condition on the $2 \times 2$ pivots for which we require $\|\beta\| < \varepsilon_2$. Since we divide by the determinant of the $2 \times 2$ pivot $\beta$ we need it to be bounded away from zero [7, Sec. 4.3].

With this monitoring strategy one is not restricted to Bunch-Parlett and we also tried it for the Bunch-Kaufman method. In the next section we show the results for two benchmark problems in Tab. 1, 2 and the amount of work reduction for constructing the permutation matrices $P$. However, the monitoring of pivots as presented is only a heuristic. We do not have at hand the stability analysis of such modified Bunch-Parlett and Bunch-Kaufman methods.

# 7 Computational Experiments

In this section we apply our hybrid method 5 on two benchmark problems from the paper [13]. We test Alg. 5 with and without the monitoring strategy for updating the permutation matrix and compare the results. Both following benchmark problems are described in detail in the paper [13] and we solve them with the Line-search SQP (LS-SQP) method [19, 17]. In this paper, we consider only equality constraints, hence, the block $C$ in (2) is the zero matrix. For the readers convenience we describe the governing differential equations of those dynamical systems.

The first benchmark problem [13, Sec. 6.2] is a linear dynamical system given by

$$\dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} x,$$

where the statespace dimension is $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It was shown in [13] that the Hessian matrix is singular and observed that the BFGS approximation of the Hessian approach a singular matrix. This leads to a saddle-point matrix $K$ that has the $(1,1)$ block ill-conditioned.

The second benchmark problem [13, Sec. 6.3] is a nonlinear dynamical system such that

$$\dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} \sin(x_k) \\ \vdots \\ \sin(x_1) \end{bmatrix},$$

where the statespace dimension is $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Similar to the benchmark above the BFGS approximations of the Hessian approach singular matrix [13].

In both benchmark problems the sets Init and Unsafe are balls of radius $1/4$. The stopping criteria on the norm of the gradient, the norm of the vector of constraints, the maximum number of iterations and the minimal step-size are the same as in the paper [13]. For our monitoring strategy in Alg. 5 we set $\varepsilon_1 = 10^{-3}$ and $\varepsilon_2 = 10^6$. The results for the first benchmark problem are shown in the Tab. 1 and for the second benchmark problem in the Tab. 2 respectively. In all instances we were able to find a desired solution from $N$ solution segments for which $x_0^1 \in \text{Init}$ and $\Phi(\sum t_i, x_0^1) \in \text{Unsafe}$.

Both tables 1 and 2 have four parts. The first part consists of two columns denoted by $k$ – the statespace dimension of the dynamical system and by $N$ – the number of solution segments. The second part corresponds to Alg. 5 with no monitoring of pivots and there are three columns: $\#IT$ – the number of iterations in Alg. 5, $\#LDL^T$ – the number of straightforward $LDL^T$ factorizations, and $\#B\text{-}P/B\text{-}K$ – the number of Bunch-Parlett/Bunch-Kaufman factorizations. The third part shows the results of Alg. 5 with the monitoring of pivots. The meaning of columns $\#IT$ and $\#LDL^T$ remains the same. However, the column denoted by "#upd of $P$" shows how many times the matrix $P$ was computed and updated. In the end the last column gives the speed up $S$ in finding the pivots

$$S = \left\lfloor \frac{\#B\text{-}P/B\text{-}K}{\#\text{upd of } P} \right\rfloor.$$

It may happen that the sum of numbers from $\#LDL^T$ and $\#B\text{-}P/B\text{-}K$ columns is greater than the number in the column $\#IT$ because of the restarts in the LS-SQP method [13]. Whenever there is a single value in a column, then both Bunch-Parlett and Bunch-Kaufman yield the same results. If the values in columns $\#IT$ in one row differ we do not compute the speed up $S$. The same applies when only the $LDL^T$ factorization with no pivoting was used.

We read the results in Tab. 1 and 2 in the following way. For example the last row of Tab. 1 is: the statespace dimension $k = 40$ and the number of solution segments $N = 30$ result in the optimization problem with $30(40 + 1) = 1230$ parameters and $(30 - 1)40 + 2 = 1162$ equality constraints. Then the saddle-point matrix $K$ is of order 2392; Alg. 5 with no monitoring of pivots took 59 iterations from which the matrix $K$ was factorized 9 times by $LDL^T$ with no pivoting and 50 times by Bunch-Parlett/Bunch-Kaufman. When we used Alg. 5 with the monitoring of pivots the matrix $P$ was computed once in the 10th iteration. From this point onwards it was updated twice, therefore, the matrix $P$ was reused 47 times. The speed up $S$ is then $\lfloor 50 : 3 \rfloor = 16$

We demonstrated in Tab. 1 and 2 that we can switch between a cheap factorization ($LDL^T$ without pivoting) and Bunch-Parlett. In addition we can minimize the cost of finding the pivots in the Bunch-Parlett method. The monitoring strategy that allows us to reuse the permutation matrices in the Bunch-Parlett method is independent of our application and may be used in other problems as well.

We can compare the results in Tab. 1 and 2 with the results in the paper [13], where the preconditioned projected conjugate gradient (PPCG) method [17, 19] was used. For

| $k$ | $N$ | $\#IT$ | $\#LDL^T$ | $\#B\text{-}P/B\text{-}K$ | $\#IT$ | $\#LDL^T$ | #upd of $P$ | $S$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 5 | 47 | 5 | 42 | 47 | 5 | 1 | 42 |
| | 10 | 26 | 19 | 7 | 26 | 19 | 1 | 7 |
| | 15 | 31 | 17 | 14 | 31 | 17 | 1 | 14 |
| | 20 | 400 | 3 | 418/408 | 111/258 | 3 | 2/5 | - |
| | 25 | 45 | 17 | 28 | 45 | 17 | 1 | 28 |
| | 30 | 131/125 | 11 | 120/116 | 89/78 | 11 | 8/4 | - |
| 20 | 5 | 25 | 27 | 0 | 25 | 27 | 0 | 0 |
| | 10 | 27 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 27 | 0 | - |
| | 15 | 24 | 9 | 15 | 24 | 9 | 1 | 15 |
| | 20 | 23 | 3 | 20 | 23 | 3 | 1/3 | 20/6 |
| | 25 | 27 | 5 | 22 | 27 | 5 | 1/2 | 22/11 |
| | 30 | 34 | 20 | 14 | 34 | 20 | 1 | 14 |
| 30 | 5 | 36 | 36 | 0 | 36 | 36 | 0 | - |
| | 10 | 24 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 24 | 0 | - |
| | 15 | 26 | 10 | 16 | 26 | 10 | 1 | 16 |
| | 20 | 28 | 23 | 5 | 28 | 23 | 1 | 5 |
| | 25 | 24 | 10 | 14 | 24 | 10 | 1 | 14 |
| | 30 | 24 | 6 | 18 | 24 | 6 | 1 | 18 |
| 40 | 5 | 41 | 41 | 0 | 41 | 41 | 0 | - |
| | 10 | 24 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 24 | 0 | - |
| | 15 | 24 | 3 | 21 | 24 | 3 | 1/2 | 21/10 |
| | 20 | 20 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 15 |
| | 25 | 37 | 11 | 26 | 37 | 11 | 1 | 26 |
| | 30 | 59 | 9 | 50 | 59 | 9 | 3 | 16 |

Table 1: The results for the linear benchmark problem [13, Sec. 6.2]. On the left hand side there are the parameters, in the middle the results of Alg. 5 with no monitoring of pivots and on the right hand side the results of Alg. 5 with the monitoring. The last column corresponds to the speed up.

the linear benchmark problem the Alg. 5 required less iterations of the LS-SQP. However, in the nonlinear case, the results are inconclusive.

All the computations were carried out in Scilab 5.5.2 [21] on a computer Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU X5680 @ 3.33GHz with the operating system Cent OS 6.8. We used the built in ode solver *ode* in the default settings and the *backslash* operator for solving systems of linear equations in Alg. 1–3 and 5.

Note that we use the term "to compute the matrix $P$" in a sense of finding a permutation of rows and columns of the matrix $K$ (2). In our implementation of Alg. 5 we never construct the matrix $P$ representing a permutation.

# 8 Summary and Conclusion

The motivation to solve the saddle-point system (2) and study its $LDL^T$ factorization comes from the application in the optimization of dynamical systems [13]. We showed in Lemmas 1, 2 and 4 the banded structure of the factor $L$ and proved that the width of bands in $L$ depends only on the parameter $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

We explored the use of the $LDL^T$ factorization with no pivoting strategy and ran into problems with the ill-conditioning of the $(1,1)$ block $H$ of the saddle-point system (2). To this end we developed the Alg. 5 that switches from $LDL^T$ with no pivoting to the Bunch-Parlett method.

| $k$ | $N$ | $\#IT$ | $\#LDL^T$ | $\#B\text{-}P/B\text{-}K$ | $\#IT$ | $\#LDL^T$ | #upd of $P$ | $S$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 5 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | - |
| | 10 | 246 | 175 | 71 | 246 | 175 | 1 | 71 |
| | 15 | 115 | 36 | 79 | 115 | 36 | 2/1 | 39/79 |
| | 20 | 98 | 17 | 81 | 98 | 17 | 1/2 | 81/40 |
| | 25 | 400 | 14 | 386 | 400 | 14 | 4/2 | 96/193 |
| | 30 | 168 | 11 | 157 | 168 | 11 | 1 | 157 |
| 20 | 5 | 67 | 17 | 50 | 67 | 17 | 1 | 50 |
| | 10 | 50 | 19 | 31 | 50 | 19 | 1 | 31 |
| | 15 | 97 | 42 | 55 | 97 | 42 | 1/2 | 55/27 |
| | 20 | 34 | 8 | 26 | 34 | 8 | 1/2 | 26/13 |
| | 25 | 289 | 10 | 279 | 289 | 10 | 2 | 139 |
| | 30 | 109 | 22 | 87 | 109 | 22 | 1 | 87 |
| 30 | 5 | 40 | 30 | 10 | 40 | 30 | 1 | 10 |
| | 10 | 47 | 30 | 17 | 47 | 30 | 1 | 17 |
| | 15 | 400 | 12 | 388 | 400 | 12 | 4 | 97 |
| | 20 | 51 | 3 | 48 | 51 | 3 | 1/3 | 48/16 |
| | 25 | 109/107 | 3 | 106/104 | 108/113 | 3 | 1/3 | - |
| | 30 | 400/177 | 20 | 380/157 | 400/374 | 20 | 2/4 | - |
| 40 | 5 | 113 | 49 | 64 | 113 | 49 | 1 | 64 |
| | 10 | 400 | 97 | 303 | 400 | 97 | 1 | 303 |
| | 15 | 210/211 | 10 | 200/201 | 207/213 | 10 | 1/2 | - |
| | 20 | 58 | 25 | 33 | 58 | 25 | 1 | 33 |
| | 25 | 134 | 1 | 133 | 134 | 1 | 1/3 | 133/44 |
| | 30 | 146 | 12 | 134 | 146/155 | 12 | 4/5 | - |

Table 2: The results for the nonlinear benchmark problem [13, Sec. 6.3]. On the left hand side there are the parameters, in the middle the results of Alg. 5 with no monitoring of pivots and on the right hand side the results of Alg. 5 with the monitoring. The last column corresponds to the speed up.

Since we need to solve the saddle-point system in every iteration of the optimization method we also aim at reducing the cost of the Bunch-Parlett method. To this end we proposed and tested the pivot monitoring strategy that allows us to reuse and update the permutation matrices. As shown in section 7, this appears to be a successful approach to speed up the computation.

# Acknowledgement

We thank Miroslav Rozložník and Ladislav Lukšan for comments that greatly improved the manuscript.

# References

[1] U. Ascher and R. D. Russell. Reformulation of boundary value problems into "standard" form. *SIAM Rev.*, 23(2):238–254, 1981.

[2] U. M. Ascher and L. R. Petzold. *Computer methods for ordinary differential equations and differential-algebraic equations*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1998.

[3] M. Benzi, G. H. Golub, and J. Liesen. Numerical solution of saddle point problems. *Acta Numer.*, 14:1–137, 2005.

[4] J. T. Betts. *Practical methods for optimal control and estimation using nonlinear programming*, volume 19 of *Advances in Design and Control*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, second edition, 2010.

[5] M. S. Branicky, M. M. Curtiss, J. Levine, and S. Morgan. Sampling-based planning, control and verification of hybrid systems. *IEE Proceedings - Control Theory and Applications*, 153:575–590(15), September 2006.

[6] J. R. Bunch and L. Kaufman. Some stable methods for calculating inertia and solving symmetric linear systems. *Math. Comp.*, 31(137):163–179, 1977.

[7] J. R. Bunch and B. N. Parlett. Direct methods for solving symmetric indefinite systems of linear equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 8:639–655, 1971.

[8] A. Chutinan and B. H. Krogh. Computational techniques for hybrid system verification. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 48(1):64–75, 2003.

[9] A. Fehnker and F. Ivančić. Benchmarks for hybrid systems verification. In R. Alur and G. Pappas, editors, *Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, volume 2993 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 326–341. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004.

[10] P. E. Gill, W. Murray, and M. H. Wright. *Practical optimization*. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London-New York, 1981.

[11] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan. *Matrix computations*. Johns Hopkins Studies in the Mathematical Sciences. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, third edition, 1996.

[12] I. Hiskens and M. Pai. Trajectory sensitivity analysis of hybrid systems. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, 47(2):204–220, Feb 2000.

[13] J. Kuřátko. Solving reachability problems with singular and indefinite hessian by sequential quadratic programming. Submitted and available at https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.01051, 2016.

[14] J. Kuřátko and S. Ratschan. Solving underdetermined boundary value problems by sequential quadratic programming. Submitted and available at https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.09078, 2016.

[15] F. Lamiraux, E. Ferré, and E. Vallée. Kinodynamic motion planning: connecting exploration trees using trajectory optimization methods. In *Robotics and Automation, 2004. Proceedings. ICRA '04. 2004 IEEE International Conference on*, volume 4, pages 3987–3992, 2004.

[16] L. Lukšan, C. Matonoha, and J. Vlček. Interior-point method for non-linear nonconvex optimization. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, 11(5-6):431–453, 2004.

[17] L. Lukšan and J. Vlček. Numerical experience with iterative methods for equality constrained nonlinear programming problems. *Optim. Methods Softw.*, 16(1-4):257–287, 2001. Dedicated to Professor Laurence C. W. Dixon on the occasion of his 65th birthday.

[18] E. Möhlmann and O. Theel. Stabhyli—a tool for automatic stability verification of non-linear hybrid systems. In *HSCC'13—Hybrid systems: computation and control*, pages 107–112. ACM, New York, 2013.

[19] J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright. *Numerical optimization*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, New York, second edition, 2006.

[20] E. Plaku, L. E. Kavraki, and M. Y. Vardi. Hybrid systems: from verification to falsification by combining motion planning and discrete search. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 34(2):157–182, 2009.

[21] Scilab Enterprises. *Scilab: Free and Open Source software for Numerical Computation.* Scilab Enterprises, Orsay, France, 2012.

[22] D. C. Sorensen. Updating the symmetric indefinite factorization with applications in a modified newton's method.[symupd; also pivixi and piv2x2 for pivoting]. Technical report, Argonne National Lab., IL (USA), 1977.

[23] M. Tůma. A note on the $LDL^T$ decomposition of matrices from saddle-point problems. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 23(4):903–915, 2002.

[24] R. J. Vanderbei. Symmetric quasidefinite matrices. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 5(1):100–113, 1995.

[25] A. Zutshi, S. Sankaranarayanan, J. V. Deshmukh, and J. Kapinski. A trajectory splicing approach to concretizing counterexamples for hybrid systems. In *Decision and Control (CDC), 2013 IEEE 52nd Annual Conference*, pages 3918–3925, 2013.